

Indian Affairs

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker:—but, all this having been said, I am sure the hon. member for Edmonton Centre, who is a well liked member of the House, will appreciate the position of the Chair.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

CONCURRENCE IN SECOND REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

On the order: Motions:

April 4, 1973—Mr. Howard:

That the second report of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development, presented to the House on April 4, 1973, be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Yesterday when the hon. member for Skeena proposed to move that the second report of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development, presented to the House on April 4, 1973, be concurred in, the Chair suggested that it might be irregular to proceed with the said motion at that time. With the assistance provided by the hon. member himself in his submission to the House, the Chair has given careful consideration to this matter. It would appear to me that not only is the rule of anticipation involved here but there is also the application of certain Standing Orders which I suggest bear on this case.

● (1410)

The hon. member has obviously given serious thought to the procedural difficulty involved. It seems to me that in the submission of his argument he has agreed with the proposition that his motion anticipated the order for the adjourned debate on the motion proposed by the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands. Incidentally, the records indicate that the hon. member for Skeena seconded that motion. That in itself introduces a further complication which I will merely mention and on which I will not make a ruling.

As the hon. member pointed out yesterday, the Chair, in interpreting the rule on anticipation, should have regard to the probability of the matter being brought before the House within a reasonable time. I would suggest that the probability of resuming debate on a motion by the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands is still an open question. The Chair must assume that that probability is still open.

In my view, consideration of two specific Standing Orders touching upon the procedural question is relevant at this time. Standing Order 45(2) reads as follows:

When a debate on any motion made prior to the reading of the Orders of the Day is adjourned or interrupted, the order for resumption of the same shall be transferred to and considered under government orders.

[Mr. Speaker.]

That Standing Order was permanently enacted in 1968 on the same occasion that the House, in the words of the hon. member for Skeena, "embarked upon a new structure and concept regarding the operation of the standing committees." The Chair cannot assume that the committees and the House as well were not fully aware at the time of the effect of the provisions of that Standing Order.

Finally, the Chair must refer to section 2 of Standing Order 18 which reads as follows:

Government orders shall be called and considered in such sequence as the government determines.

The provisions of that Standing Order, I suggest, are so clear and explicit that they preclude the Chair or any member other than those in the government from designating any government order to be taken up at any sitting.

As stated in citation 13 of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition:

... An express order of the House, whether standing or occasional, supersedes every mere usage or precedent. In the absence of any express order "what can or ought to be done by either House of Parliament is best known by the custom and proceedings of parliament in former times."

Without a doubt the anticipation rule must be taken into account as a guide in our proceedings, but in this case its application must be interpreted in the context of the Standing Orders to which I have referred.

The Chair has no difficulty about the hon. member's motion being allowed to remain on the order paper but I suggest, with respect, to the hon. member that it would be difficult to accept from a procedural standpoint that the motion be put and debated at this time.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might, therefore, with the consent of the House, ask leave to withdraw the motion, saving always the right to reintroduce it at an appropriate time in the future.

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

BEEF—GOVERNMENT POLICIES RESPECTING EXPORTS AND TARIFF—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Danforth.

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex): Kent-Essex, Mr. Speaker.

I respectfully request leave of the House to present a motion under Standing Order 43. The matter is of most urgent and serious concern to all Canadians in general and to the producers of cattle specifically. If the House is sympathetically disposed to grant approval, I propose to move, seconded by the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Hargrave):

That the government policies on the restriction on exports of beef and especially the removal of tariff protection on this commodity entering Canada without a reciprocal agreement with the